

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 49 through 56, all newly-presented, are pending, with Claims 49 and 53 being independent. Claims 34 through 48 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 34 through 48 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,060 (Young) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,760,537 B2 (Mankovitz) and 4,489,351 (d'Alayer de Costemore d'Arc). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 49 and 53 variously recite, inter alia, that the control unit or step (that determines a selection of the first tuner or the second tuner) acquires the information of the second plurality of channels to be stored in the first memory at a predetermined timing and updates the first memory with the acquired information.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Young, Mankovitz, and d'Alayer de Costemore d'Arc, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed combinations of features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 49 and 53.

Applicants respectfully submit that Young shows, e.g., that listing information and other support data will be transmitted over the VBI several times a day or continuously, and the listing data is stored in schedule memory 232 while the cable channel assignment data is stored in cable-specific RAM memory 238. And the Official Action relies specifically upon Young's statement that the schedule/tape controller may be integrated into other television equipment such as a cable decoder or a TV/monitor receiver (e.g., col. 17, lines 21-25). Turning to Mankovitz, the Official Action asserts that said document teaches providing the G-code decoder in the television receiver, VCR, cable box, or satellite receiver. However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the foregoing

nor the remainder of Young, Mankovitz, and d'Alayer de Costemore d'Arc provides either a description or a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 49 and 53.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicants  
Daniel S. Glueck  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/cmg

DC\_MAIN 229029v1